## State of California The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Responses to Public Recommendations for Changes in the 2003-04 Waterfowl Regulations Received by the Fish and Game Commission Between July 8 and August 28,2003

## Section 507c - Prohibition on Electronic or Mechanically-Operated Devices

- a) <u>Fourteen letters</u> dated July 18 through August 25, 2003: requesting a ban on spinning wing decoys.
  - <u>Department Response:</u> Supports alternative #3 in ISOR proposed by DFG.
- b) Sixty-one letters dated June 26 through August 28, 2003 and oral testimony given by Barry Kelly at the 08/01/03 Commission meeting and Doug McGeoghegan, Eric Mills, Virginia Handley, Kevin Burroughs, Rob Plath, Craig Bell, Lucy Nelson, Louisa Jaskulski, Pat Maginnis, Todd Frediani, Brian Vincent, Madeline Sone, Rob Dias, and Mike Riley at the 08/28/03 Commission meeting: requesting a ban on electronic decoys.
  - Department Response: Supports alternative #4 in ISOR proposed by DFG.
- c) Seven letters dated August 15 through August 26, 2003 and oral testimony given by Gerald DeLucchi, Jim Vantross, and David Schell at the 08/28/03 Commission meeting: requesting that the regulation on spinning wing decoys remains the same as in the 2002-03 waterfowl hunting season.
  - <u>Department Response</u>: Supports alternative #1 in ISOR proposed by DFG.
- d) <u>Four letters</u> dated August 13 through August 25, 2003: requesting that spinning wing decoys be allowed throughout the waterfowl hunting season.
  - <u>Department Response</u>: Supports alternative #2 in ISOR proposed by DFG.
- e) <u>Three letters</u> dated August 23 through August 25, 2003: requesting that electronic decoys not be banned.
  - Department Response: Supports alternative #2 in ISOR proposed by DFG.

- f) <u>Comment by Dean A. Cortopassi</u>, letter dated July 21, 2003: requests the ban of spinning wing decoys on all privately owned lands.
  - <u>Department Response</u>: Reject. Imposing a regulation on private hunting areas creates a complicated regulation and unfairly targets private land hunters.
- g) <u>Comment by Thomas E. Foran</u>, letter dated August 13, 2003: requests spinning wing decoys be allowed on the last weekend of waterfowl season.
  - <u>Department Response</u>: Reject. This would complicate regulations.
- h) Comment by Robert McLandress of the California Waterfowl Association, letter dated July 23,2003: expressed concerns over using new technologies in waterfowl hunting and to formulate controls to stop further proliferation of high-tech devices.

Department Response: Accept.

## State of California

## **FISH AND GAME COMMISSION**

Addendum to Final Statement (response to public comment)

There were numerous comments from the public to ban spinning wing decoys. In direct response to the question of why Moto ducks (spinning wing decoys) were not banned was due to there being no sound biological data showing detrimental effect to the waterfowl population or the environment.